

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Final Office Action dated March 29, 2004. In that Action, the Examiner 1) rejected claims 16, 18, 20, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Blake* (U.S. Patent 3,770,232); 2) rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Blake* in view of *Shah et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,137,747); 3) rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Blake* in view of *Phelps, Jr. et al.* (U.S. Patent 4,062,422); 4) objected to claim 22 as being dependent on a rejected base claim; and 5) allowed claims 1-15, 17, 19, and 25-26.

Objected Claims

Claim 22 has been amended to include all of the limitations of the previous base claim. Claim 22 should now be in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a)

Claims 16, 18, 20, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 3,770,232, issued to Blake (hereinafter *Blake*). Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Blake* in view of U.S. Patent 6,137,747, issued to Shah et al. (hereinafter *Shah*) and claim 24 was rejected as being unpatentable over *Blake* in view of U.S. Patent 4,062,422, issued to Phelps, Jr. et al. (hereinafter *Phelps*).

Claim 16 has been cancelled but the applicants reserve the right to pursue claim 16, as well as any other claims, in continuing applications as may be appropriate.

Claims 18, 20, 21, 23, and 24 have been amended to now depend from claims that have been allowed. Therefore, claims 18, 20, 21, 23, and 24 should also be allowed.

Conclusions

During the course of these remarks, Applicant has at times referred to particular limitations of the claims which are not shown in the applied prior art. This short-hand approach to discussing

Appln. No. 10/007,955
Amdt. Dated May 21, 2004
Reply to Office Action of March 29, 2004

the claims should not be construed to mean that the other claimed limitations are not part of the claimed invention. They are as required by law. Consequently, when interpreting the claims, each of the claims should be construed as a whole, and patentability determined in light of this required claim construction.

Each of the pending claims has either been determined to be allowable over the art or has been amended to depend from a claim that has been allowed. It is the Applicant's intention that this case is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this communication, he is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite the resolution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



DEREK V. FORINASH
Reg. No. 47,231
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
P. O. Box 3267
Houston, Texas 77253-3267
(713) 238-8000
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT